arXiv:1612.09049v1 [hep-ph] 29 Dec 2016

STUPP-16-228

Analysis of right-handed majorana neutrino mass in $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ Pati–Salam model with democratic texture

Masaki J. S. Yang

Department of Physics, Saitama University,
Shimo-okubo, Sakura-ku, Saitama, 338-8570, Japan

Abstract

In this paper, we attempt to build an unified model with democratic texture, that have some unification between Y_ν and Y_u. Since the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry is chiral, the unified gauge group is assumed to be Pati-Salam type $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$. The flavor symmetry breaking scheme is considered to be $S_{3L} \times S_{3R} \to S_{2L} \times S_{2R} \to 0$. In this picture, the four-zero texture is desirable for realistic mass and mixings. This texture is realized by a specific representation for the second breaking of the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry.

Assuming only renormalizable Yukawa interactions, type-I seesaw mechanism, and neglecting CP phases for simplicity, M_R can be reconstructed from low energy input values. Numerical analysis shows that the texture of M_R basically behave like the "waterfall texture". Since M_R tend to be the cascade texture in the democratic texture approach, an unified model with up-type Yukawa unification $Y_\nu \simeq Y_u$ and type-I seesaw basically requires fine tuning between parameters (including its CP phases, errors of the input parameters, and gauge symmetry breaking schemes). Otherwise, the origin of the waterfall texture of M_R should be arranged in a different way.

1 Introduction

The flavor puzzle is one of the most stringent problem in the current particle physics. In particular, the quark mixing matrix $U_{\rm CKM}$ [1, 2] and the lepton mixing matrix $U_{\rm PMNS}$ [3, 4] are curiously different. Various models and ideas have been considered, to explain the underlying flavor dynamics of the standard model. Typical approaches treat the continuous or discrete flavor symmetries [5–7], and/or specific flavor textures [8,9]. In the latter approach, many researchers have studied the democratic texture [10–27]. In this approach, Yukawa interactions are assumed to have the "democratic matrix" in Eq. (1), which is realized by $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ symmetry.

To explore more fundamental understanding of flavor, building some unified models is a valuable method. The grand unified theory (GUT) with democratic texture is only discussed in [28, 29], as far as the author knows. However, in these papers, unification between neutrino Yukawa matrix Y_ν and other Y_f is difficult, because degenerated Y_ν is assumed. Then, in this paper, we attempt to build other unified model with democratic texture, that have some unification between Y_ν and Y_u. Since the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry is chiral, the unified gauge group is assumed to be Pati–Salam (PS) type $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ (G_{422}) [30]. The flavor symmetry breaking scheme is considered to be $S_{3L} \times S_{3R} \to S_{2L} \times S_{2R} \to 0$. In this picture, the four-zero texture [31–34] is desirable for realistic mass and mixings. This texture is realized by a specific representation for the second breaking of the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry [35–37].

Assuming only renormalizable Yukawa interactions, type-I seesaw mechanism [38], and neglecting CP phases for simplicity, M_R can be reconstructed from low energy input values. Numerical analysis shows that the lighter matrix elements of M_R basically behave like the waterfall texture in Table 1. Since M_R tend to be the cascade texture in the democratic texture approach, an unified model with up-type Yukawa unification $Y_\nu \simeq Y_u$ and type-I seesaw basically requires fine tuning between parameters (including its CP phases, errors of the input parameters, and gauge symmetry breaking schemes). Otherwise, the origin of the waterfall texture of M_R should be arranged in a different way.

$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & \delta & \delta \\ \epsilon & \delta & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \epsilon\delta & \epsilon \\ \epsilon\delta & \delta^2 & \delta \\ \epsilon & \delta & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
cascade	waterfall

Table 1: The cascade and waterfall texture, where $1 \gg \delta \gg \epsilon$ [39].

In this analysis, we assume only renormalizable yukawa interactions. However, this strong tendency to the waterfall texture originates from the seesaw relation $M_R \sim Y_u^T Y_u$. Therefore, it would be rather robust for non-renormalizable yukawa interactions, as far as the type-I seesaw mechanism is assumed.

This paper is organized as follows. The next section is review of the Yukawa matrices with democratic texture. In Sect. 3, we construct an unified model with $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor

symmetry. Section 4 is numerical analysis of texture of M_R in this model. Section 5 is devoted to conclusions.

2 The four-zero texture from democratic matrix approach

The democratic matrix is defined as

$$Y_f^0 = \frac{K_f}{3}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \frac{K_f}{3} D, \tag{1}$$

that is invariant under $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$, the permutation symmetry between lows and columns. It is diagonalized by

$$U_{\rm DC} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \\ 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

and eigenvalues are given by $Y_{fi} = \mathrm{diag}(0, 0, K_f)$. Then, the democratic matrix produces mass only for the third generation. In order to provide masses for the first and second generations, The flavor symmetry should be broken as $S_{3L} \times S_{3R} \to S_{2L} \times S_{2R} \to 0$. Then, Yukawa matrix is represented as

$$Y_f = \frac{K_f}{3} D + \delta_f Y_f^\delta + \epsilon_f Y_f^\epsilon, \tag{3}$$

where $Y_f^{\delta(\epsilon)}$ breaks $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}\,(S_{2L} \times S_{2R})$. This breaking scheme is discussed in several papers [37, 40–44]. The following discussion is equivalent to the Ref. [37].

The term $\delta_f Y_f^\delta$ is invariant under $S_{2L} \times S_{2R}$ between first and second indices, in order to provide mass only for the second generation. The most general form of $S_{2L} \times S_{2R}$ invariant symmetric Y_f^δ is

$$Y_f^\delta = \begin{pmatrix} a & a & b \\ a & a & b \\ b & b & c \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

For later convenience, we parametrize $\delta_f Y_f^\delta$ as follows:

$$\delta_f Y_f^\delta = \delta_f \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2}r}{3} + \frac{1}{6} & \frac{\sqrt{2}r}{3} + \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{r}{3\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2}r}{3} + \frac{1}{6} & \frac{\sqrt{2}r}{3} + \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{r}{3\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{3} \\ -\frac{r}{3\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{r}{3\sqrt{2}} - \frac{1}{3} & \frac{2}{3} - \frac{2\sqrt{2}r}{3} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

In Eq. (5), there are two free parameters r, δ_f. However, it does not lose generality, because one of the parameters in Eq. (4) can be absorbed by the redefinition of K_f. Similarly, $\epsilon_f Y_f^\epsilon$ provide mass for the first generations. Refs. [36, 37] proposed that $\epsilon_f Y_f^\epsilon$ may be the doublet complex tensorial representation of the $S_{3(L+R)}$ diagonal subgroup:

$$\epsilon_f Y_f^\epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 & i\epsilon_2 & -\epsilon_1 - i\epsilon_2 \\ -i\epsilon_2 & -\epsilon_1 & \epsilon_1 + i\epsilon_2 \\ -\epsilon_1 + i\epsilon_2 & \epsilon_1 - i\epsilon_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

In this case, the Yukawa matrices are approximately diagonalized as

$$U_{\rm DC}^\dagger Y_f U_{\rm DC} = U_{\rm DC}^\dagger \left[\frac{K_f}{3} D + \delta_f Y_f^\delta + \epsilon_f Y_f^\epsilon \right] U_{\rm DC} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon_f e^{i\phi_f} & 0 \\ \epsilon_f e^{-i\phi_f} & \delta_f & r\delta_f \\ 0 & r\delta_f & K_f \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

where $\epsilon_f e^{i\phi_f} = \sqrt{3}\,(\epsilon_1 + i\epsilon_2)$. Then, these Yukawa matrices leads to "four-zero texture" or "modified Fritzsch texture" [31–34]. This relationship between the democratic texture and the four-zero texture is studied by many authors [35–37].

In order to reproduce observed mass eigenvalues and mixings, the hierarchical relation

$$K_f \gg \delta_f \gg \epsilon_f, \tag{8}$$

is required. Moreover, $r \sim O(1)$ is also required to obtain the successful CKM matrix. This is natural condition in the context of the democratic texture.

For simplicity, we neglect all CP phases of the Yukawa matrices (*c.f.*, $\phi_f = 0$ in Eq. (7)). The effect of the CP phases is discussed later. However, the qualitative result is considered to be rather robust with the finite CP phases.

For the real Yukawa matrices, Eq. (7) is perturbatively diagonalized as

$$B_f^\dagger U_{\rm DC}^\dagger Y_f U_{\rm DC} B_f = {\rm diag}(y_{1f}, y_{2f}, y_{3f}), \tag{9}$$

where

$$y_{1f} \simeq -\frac{\epsilon_f^2}{\delta_f} - \frac{r^2\epsilon_f^2}{K_f}, \qquad y_{2f} \simeq \delta_f + \frac{\epsilon_f^2}{\delta_f} - \frac{r^2\delta_f^2}{K_f}, \qquad y_{3f} \simeq K_f + \frac{r^2\delta_f^2}{K_f}. \tag{10}$$

The unitary matrices B_f at leading order (LO) are found to be

$$B_f \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{\epsilon_f}{\delta_f} & 0 \\ \frac{\epsilon_f}{\delta_f} & 1 & r\,\frac{\delta_f}{K_f} \\ -r\,\frac{\epsilon_f}{K_f} & -r\,\frac{\delta_f}{K_f} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{-\frac{y_{f1}}{y_{f2}}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{-\frac{y_{f1}}{y_{f2}}} & 1 & r\,\frac{y_{f2}}{y_{f3}} \\ -r\,\sqrt{-\frac{y_{f1}}{y_{f2}}}\,\frac{y_{f2}}{y_{f3}} & -r\,\frac{y_{f2}}{y_{f3}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

Note that $y_{f1}/y_{f2} \simeq -\epsilon_f^2/\delta_f^2$ is always negative.

Therefore, CKM matrix $V_{\rm CKM} = B_u^\dagger B_d$ (without complex phase) is calculated as

$$V_{\rm CKM} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} & -r\sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}\frac{m_c}{m_t} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} & 1 & -r\frac{m_c}{m_t} \\ 0 & r\frac{m_c}{m_t} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} & 1 & r\frac{m_s}{m_b} \\ -r\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}}\frac{m_s}{m_b} & -r\frac{m_s}{m_b} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{12}$$

$$\simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\left[\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} - \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}\right] & r\left[\sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}\frac{m_s}{m_b} - \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}\frac{m_c}{m_t}\right] \\ \left[\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} - \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}\right] & 1 & r\left[\frac{m_s}{m_b} - \frac{m_c}{m_t}\right] \\ r\left[\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}}\frac{m_c}{m_t} - \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}}\frac{m_s}{m_b}\right] & -r\left[\frac{m_s}{m_b} - \frac{m_c}{m_t}\right] & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Here, we omit the minus sign in the square root ($\sqrt{-m_u/m_c} \to \sqrt{m_u/m_c}$). It predicts V_{cb} and V_{ts} in the first order perturbation as follows

$$V_{cb} \simeq -V_{ts} \simeq r\left[\frac{m_s}{m_b} - \frac{m_c}{m_t}\right]. \tag{14}$$

If the parameters $K_f, \delta_f, \epsilon_f$ have CP phases, each CKM matrix elements obtain overall phases and relative phases, such as $\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} - \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} \to e^{i\phi}\left[\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} - e^{i\eta}\sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}\right]$. In particular, the best value of χ^2 fit $r = \sqrt{81/32} \simeq 1.59$ [37] gives excellent agreement between the prediction and the observation of absolute values of the CKM matrix elements.

3 $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ model with the democratic texture

To explore more fundamental understanding of flavor, building some unified models is a valuable method. The grand unified theory (GUT) with democratic texture is only discussed in [28, 29], as far as the author knows. However, in these papers, unification between Y_ν and other Y_f is difficult, because degenerated Y_ν is assumed. Then, in this paper, we attempt to build other unified model with democratic texture, in order to consider some unification between Y_ν and Y_u. Since the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry is chiral [1], the unified gauge group is assumed to be Pati–Salam (PS) type $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ (G_{422}) [30].

[1] In the $SO(10)$ GUT, flavor symmetry should be single S_3, and the condition $c_f = 0$ similar to Eq. (31) should be assumed.

In order to produce realistic fermion masses, we consider the minimal contents of Higgs fields with the following representations under the G_{422} group,

$$\Phi = (1,2,2), \quad \Sigma = (15,2,2), \quad \Delta_R = (10,1,3). \tag{15}$$

Although other representations are also possible, such as (4,1,2) in [45, 46], we consider only renormalizable interaction to control Yukawa interactions.

The field content of the unified model is in Table 2. This Higgs contents is sufficient to break the PS gauge group G_{224} to the SM gauge group G_{SM}. For example, symmetry breaking scheme with this Higgs contents in the PS model is discussed in the context of the noncommutative geometry [47, 48]. We do not discuss the scales and order of the symmetry breakings. However, the final result is considered to be rather independent from breaking schemes.

	$SU(4)_c$	$SU(2)_L$	$SU(2)_R$	S_{3L}	S_{3R}
$\Psi_{Li} = q_{Li}, l_{Li}$	**4**	**2**	**1**	$\mathbf{1_L + 2_L}$	$\mathbf{1_R}$
$\Psi_{Ri} = q_{Ri}, l_{Ri}$	**4**	**1**	**2**	$\mathbf{1_L}$	$\mathbf{1_R + 2_R}$
Φ	**1**	**2**	**2**	$\mathbf{1_L}$	$\mathbf{1_R}$
Σ	**15**	**2**	**2**	$\mathbf{1_L}$	$\mathbf{1_R}$
Δ_R	**10**	**1**	**3**	$\mathbf{1_L}$	$\mathbf{1_R}$

Table 2: The charge assignments of the SM fermions and Higgs fields under the gauge and discrete symmetries.

The renormalizable Yukawa interaction invariant under G_{422} is found to be

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} = \bar{\Psi}_{Ri}(Y^1_{ij}\Phi + Y^{15}_{ij}\Sigma)\Psi_{Lj} + h.c.\,. \tag{16}$$

Note that Yukawa matrices $Y^{1,15}$ become symmetric matrices if we impose the left-right symmetry between $\Psi_L \leftrightarrow \Psi_R$. These $Y^{1,15}$ are divided into $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ preserving and breaking parts respectively:

$$Y^1 = K_1 D + \delta Y_1, \quad Y^{15} = K_{15} D + \delta Y_{15}. \tag{17}$$

In order to obtain the desirable mass and mixings, we assume $K_{15} = 0$ and $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ breaking δ elements are not generated by δY_1. Then Y_{15} is treated as a perturbation, as in the previous study [28]. Vacuum expectation values of these Higgs fields are taken to be

$$\langle\Phi\rangle = \text{Diag}(1,1,1,1) \times \begin{pmatrix} v^1_u & 0 \\ 0 & v^1_d \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle\Sigma\rangle = \text{Diag}(1,1,1,-3) \times \begin{pmatrix} v^{15}_u & 0 \\ 0 & v^{15}_d \end{pmatrix}, \tag{18}$$

in the representation space of $\Psi_{L,R} = (q^1_{L,R}, q^2_{L,R}, q^3_{L,R}, l_{L,R})$.

These set up leads to the following mass matrices [49–51]

$$M_u = v_u^1(K_1 D + \delta Y_1) + v_u^{15}\delta Y_{15} = v_u^1 K_1 D + v_u^1 \delta Y_1 + v_u^{15}\delta Y_{15}, \tag{19}$$
$$M_\nu^D = v_u^1(K_1 D + \delta Y_1) - 3v_u^{15}\delta Y_{15} = v_u^1 K_1 D + v_u^1 \delta Y_1 - 3v_u^{15}\delta Y_{15}, \tag{20}$$
$$M_d = v_d^1(K_1 D + \delta Y_1) + v_d^{15}\delta Y_{15} = v_d^1 K_1 D + v_d^1 \delta Y_1 + v_d^{15}\delta Y_{15}, \tag{21}$$
$$M_e = v_d^1(K_1 D + \delta Y_1) - 3v_d^{15}\delta Y_{15} = v_d^1 K_1 D + v_d^1 \delta Y_1 - 3v_d^{15}\delta Y_{15}. \tag{22}$$

In particular, Yukawa matrices are explicitly written as

$$Y_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon_u & 0 \\ \epsilon_u & \delta_u & r\delta_u \\ 0 & r\delta_u & K_u \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon_d & 0 \\ \epsilon_d & \delta_d & r\delta_d \\ 0 & r\delta_d & K_d \end{pmatrix}, \tag{23}$$
$$Y_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon_\nu & 0 \\ \epsilon_\nu & \delta_\nu & r\delta_\nu \\ 0 & r\delta_\nu & K_\nu \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon_e & 0 \\ \epsilon_e & \delta_e & r\delta_e \\ 0 & r\delta_e & K_e \end{pmatrix}, \tag{24}$$

with

$$K_{u,d} = K_{\nu,e}, \quad \delta_{u,d} = -\frac{1}{3}\delta_{\nu,e}, \quad \epsilon_{u,d} = \epsilon_{\nu,e}. \tag{25}$$

These condition leads to the famous Georgi–Jarlskog relation [52]

$$m_d = 3m_e, \qquad m_s = \frac{1}{3}m_\mu, \qquad m_b = m_\tau, \tag{26}$$

and similar formula holds for up-type fermions.

4 Analysis of the right-handed majorana neutrino mass

In this section, we analyze the right-handed neutrino mass M_R in the PS model with four-zero textures. Many paper have studied this kind of model, such as SO(10) GUT with four-zero texture [32, 33, 53, 54]. However, the purpose of this paper is to analyze texture of M_R quantitatively in the context of GUT with democratic texture.

M_R emerges from the following interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Majorana}} = \bar{\Psi}_{Ri}^c Y_{ij}^{10} \Delta_R \Psi_{Rj} + h.c.\,, \tag{27}$$

when Δ_R obtain a vacuum expectation value

$$\langle \Delta_R \rangle = \text{Diag}(0,0,0,1) \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ v_R & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{28}$$

Because Y^{10} is transformed as $(1_R + 2_R) \times (1_R + 2_R)$, it has two S_{3R} invariant terms [16]

$$Y^{10} = K_{10} D + c_{10} \mathbf{1}_3 + \delta Y_{10}. \tag{29}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_3$ is the 3×3 identity matrix.

To obtain the observed light neutrino masses, we assume the type I seesaw mechanism [38]

$$m_\nu = \frac{v^2}{2} Y_\nu^T M_R^{-1} Y_\nu. \tag{30}$$

In this case,

$$\delta Y_{10} \gg c_{10} \simeq 0, \tag{31}$$

is required by phenomenological reason. The analysis shown later reveals that Y_ν with a large $c_{10} \gg \delta Y_{10}$ are incompatible to obtain the observed large neutrino mixing.

If the flavor symmetry breaking $S_{3L} \times S_{3R} \to S_{2L} \times S_{2R} \to 0$ also controls the structure of M_R, and if there is no fine tuning between the parameters, the form of M_R should be the following "cascade texture" in Table 1 [39]:

$$M_R \sim M \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & \delta & \delta \\ \epsilon & \delta & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{32}$$

The light neutrino mass Eq. (30) is diagonalized by

$$m_\nu \equiv V_\nu m_\nu^{\rm diag} V_\nu^\dagger, \tag{33}$$

where $m_\nu^{\rm diag} = {\rm diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$. This mass matrix is rewritten as

$$m_\nu = B_e U_{\rm PMNS}\, m_\nu^{\rm diag}\, U_{\rm PMNS}^\dagger B_e^\dagger, \tag{34}$$

with the neutrino mixing matrix $U_{\rm PMNS} = B_e^\dagger V_\nu$ and Eq. (11) for the charged leptons.

Ignoring all of the complex phase for simplicity, we can reconstruct M_R by the seesaw formula:

$$M_R = \frac{v^2}{2} Y_\nu^T m_\nu^{-1} Y_\nu \tag{35}$$

$$= \frac{v^2}{2} Y_\nu^T B_e U_{\rm PMNS}\, (m_\nu^{\rm diag})^{-1}\, U_{\rm PMNS}^\dagger B_e^\dagger Y_\nu. \tag{36}$$

As a benchmark, we evaluate $M_R(\Lambda_{\rm GUT}) = Y_\nu(\Lambda_{\rm GUT})^T m_\nu(\Lambda_{\rm GUT}) Y_\nu(\Lambda_{\rm GUT})$ at the GUT

scale $\Lambda_{\rm GUT} = 2 \times 10^{16}$GeV:

$$\frac{M_R(\Lambda_{\rm GUT})}{[\rm GeV]} \simeq \frac{[\rm meV]}{m_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1.876 \times 10^7 & -3.623 \times 10^8 & -1.009 \times 10^{11} \\ -3.623 \times 10^8 & 6.996 \times 10^9 & 1.948 \times 10^{12} \\ -1.009 \times 10^{11} & 1.948 \times 10^{12} & 5.424 \times 10^{14} \end{pmatrix} \tag{37}$$

$$+ \frac{[\rm meV]}{m_2} \begin{pmatrix} 3.302 \times 10^7 & -2.173 \times 10^9 & -2.849 \times 10^{11} \\ -2.173 \times 10^9 & 1.429 \times 10^{11} & 1.874 \times 10^{13} \\ -2.849 \times 10^{11} & 1.874 \times 10^{13} & 2.457 \times 10^{15} \end{pmatrix} \tag{38}$$

$$+ \frac{[\rm meV]}{m_3} \begin{pmatrix} 6.255 \times 10^7 & 1.012 \times 10^{10} & 3.975 \times 10^{11} \\ 1.012 \times 10^{10} & 1.637 \times 10^{12} & 6.431 \times 10^{13} \\ 3.975 \times 10^{11} & 6.431 \times 10^{13} & 2.526 \times 10^{15} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{39}$$

The parameter used here is summarized in the Table. 3. The fermion masses at the GUT

$m_u\,(\rm MeV)$	0.48	θ^l_{12}	33.48°
$m_c\,(\rm GeV)$	0.235	θ^l_{23}	42.3°
$m_t\,(\rm GeV)$	74.0	θ^l_{13}	8.5°
$m_e\,(\rm MeV)$	0.470	$\Delta m^2_{31}(\rm eV^2)$	2.457×10^{-3}
$m_\mu\,(\rm MeV)$	99.14	$\Delta m^2_{21}(\rm eV^2)$	7.50×10^{-5}
$m_\tau\,(\rm MeV)$	1685		

Table 3: Input values (for the SM) at the scale $M_{\rm GUT} = 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV. Similar parameter set is used in [55].

scale $m_f(\Lambda_{\rm GUT})$ are taken from [56]. In the most cases, the light neutrino masses m_i become normal and hierarchical in this model. The inverted hierarchy $m_1 \simeq m_2 \ll m_3$ is unnatural because the hierarchy of M_R should be overcome the ratio m_t^2/m_c^2. The renormalization of the neutrino mass can be neglected for the normal and hierarchical case [57, 58]. Then, neutrino mixing angles and mass square differences are taken from the latest global fit [59], without renormalization running. Similar parameter set is used in [55].

Eqs. (37) - (39) shows that the right handed neutrino mass $M_R \sim Y_u^T Y_u$ rather tends to be the "waterfall texture" in Table 1 [39],

$$M_R \sim M \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \epsilon\delta & \epsilon \\ \epsilon\delta & \delta^2 & \delta \\ \epsilon & \delta & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{40}$$

for each small mass eigenvalues m_i. Then, it seems to be difficult to explain this texture by the breaking scheme of the flavor symmetry $S_{3L} \times S_{3R} \to S_{2L} \times S_{2R} \to 0$. Hereafter we precisely check the form of the M_R by the numerical analysis.

4.1 Numerical results

Using the mass difference values Δm^2_{3i} in Table 3,

$$m_3 = \pm\sqrt{m_1^2 + 2457}\,[\mathrm{meV}], \quad m_2 = \pm\sqrt{m_1^2 + 75}\,[\mathrm{meV}], \tag{41}$$

the mass matrix M_R (37) - (39) is expressed as a function of m_1, $M_R(\Lambda_{\mathrm{GUT}}) = M_R(m_1)$.

Figure 1 shows lighter matrix elements $(M_R)_{11}, (M_R)_{12}, (M_R)_{13}$, and $(M_R)_{22}$ of the $M_R(m_1)$ at the GUT scale $\Lambda_{\mathrm{GUT}} = 2 \times 10^{16}\,[\mathrm{GeV}]$, as a function of m_1. The signature of m_2 and m_3 are taken as top of figures. From Fig. 1, we can see the hierarchical structure of the M_R. These matrix elements basically behave like the waterfall texture $(M_R)_{22} \sim (M_R)_{13} \gg (M_R)_{22} \gg (M_R)_{11}$. Several changes of sign are due to cancellation among Eqs. (37) - (39), contributions of m_i for the matrix elements of M_R.

This behavior shows that the cascade texture $(M_R)_{22} \gg (M_R)_{13} \sim (M_R)_{22} \sim (M_R)_{11}$ can not be realized without fine tunings of parameters in this model. In particular, the four-zero texture for M_R (equivalent to $(M_R)_{11} = (M_R)_{13} = 0$), is also difficult to realize without fine tuning. However, in this analysis, approximate four-zero texture $(M_R)_{12} \gg (M_R)_{13} \sim (M_R)_{11}$ is realized around $m_1 \sim 4\,\mathrm{meV}$ with $m_{2,3} < 0$.

So far, the parameters of the model have been assumed to be real. Here we will discuss on the effect of CP phases shortly. Figure 2 shows lighter matrix elements $(M_R)_{11}, (M_R)_{12}, (M_R)_{13}$, and $(M_R)_{22}$ of the $M_R(m_1)$, with finite dirac CP phase $\delta_{CP} = \pi/2$ of the PMNS matrix. Other parameters are taken to be same as Figure 1 (for m_2, only negative sign $m_2 < 0$ is presented). In Fig 2., the cancellations of $(M_R)_{ij}$ found in Fig. 1 vanish by the finite CP phases, and the cascade texture is evidently impossible with these parameter sets. By assuming finite CP phases for other parameters, we found that the cancellations are basically smoothed or vanished. It is plausible that M_R is strongly tend to be the "waterfall texture" (40). Therefore, in this democratic matrix approach, an unified model with up-type Yukawa unification $Y_\nu \simeq Y_u$ basically requires fine tuning between parameters (including its CP phases, errors of the input parameters, and gauge symmetry breaking schemes). Otherwise, the origin of the waterfall texture of M_R should be arranged in a different way.

In this analysis, we assume only renormalizable yukawa interactions. However, this strong tendency to the waterfall texture originates from the seesaw relation $M_R \sim Y_u^T Y_u$. Therefore, it would be rather robust for non-renormalizable yukawa interactions, as far as the type-I seesaw mechanism is assumed.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we attempt to build an unified model with democratic texture, that have some unification between Y_ν and Y_u. Since the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry is chiral, the unified gauge group is assumed to be Pati-Salam (PS) type $SU(4)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ (G_{422}). The flavor symmetry breaking scheme is considered to be $S_{3L} \times S_{3R} \to S_{2L} \times S_{2R} \to$



Figure 1: Lighter matrix elements $(M_R)_{11}, (M_R)_{12}, (M_R)_{13}$, and $(M_R)_{22}$ of the $M_R(m_1)$ at the GUT scale $\Lambda_{\rm GUT} = 2 \times 10^{16}$ [GeV], as a function of m_1. The signature of m_2 and m_3 are taken as top of figures.

0. In this picture, the four-zero texture is desirable for realistic mass and mixings. This texture is realized by a specific representation for the second breaking of the $S_{3L} \times S_{3R}$ flavor symmetry.

Assuming only renormalizable Yukawa interactions, type-I seesaw mechanism, and neglecting CP phases for simplicity, M_R can be reconstructed from low energy input values. Numerical analysis shows that the lighter matrix elements of M_R basically behave like the waterfall texture in Table 1. Since M_R tend to be the cascade texture in the democratic texture approach, an unified model with up-type Yukawa unification $Y_\nu \simeq Y_u$ and type-I seesaw basically requires fine tuning between parameters (including its CP phases, errors of the input parameters, and gauge symmetry breaking schemes). Otherwise, the origin of the waterfall texture of M_R should be arranged in a different way.

In this analysis, we assume only renormalizable yukawa interactions. However, this strong tendency to the waterfall texture originates from the seesaw relation $M_R \sim Y_u^T Y_u$.



Figure 2: Lighter matrix elements $(M_R)_{11}, (M_R)_{12}, (M_R)_{13}$, and $(M_R)_{22}$ of the $M_R(m_1)$, with finite dirac CP phase $\delta_{CP} = \pi/2$ of the PMNS matrix. Other parameters are taken to be same as Figure 1 (for m_2, only negative sign $m_2 < 0$ is presented).

Therefore, it would be rather robust for non-renormalizable yukawa interactions, as far as the type-I seesaw mechanism is assumed.

Acknowledgement

This study is financially supported by the Iwanami Fujukai Foundation, and the Sasakawa Scientific Research Grant from The Japan Science Society, No. 28-214.

References

[1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).

[2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).

[3] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa, and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28**, 870 (1962).

[4] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **26**, 984 (1968), [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.53,1717(1967)].

[5] C. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, Nucl.Phys. **B147**, 277 (1979).

[6] H. Ishimori *et al.*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **183**, 1 (2010), arXiv:1003.3552.

[7] I. de Medeiros Varzielas *et al.*, (2012), arXiv:1210.6239.

[8] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. **B73**, 317 (1978).

[9] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 1 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9912358.

[10] H. Harari, H. Haut, and J. Weyers, Phys. Lett. **B78**, 459 (1978).

[11] Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. **D28**, 252 (1983).

[12] Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. **D39**, 1391 (1989).

[13] M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 1586 (1990).

[14] H. Fritzsch and J. Plankl, Phys. Lett. **B237**, 451 (1990).

[15] H. Fritzsch and Z.-Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B372**, 265 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9509389.

[16] M. Fukugita, M. Tanimoto, and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 4429 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9709388.

[17] M. Tanimoto, T. Watari, and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B461**, 345 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9904338.

[18] N. Haba, Y. Matsui, N. Okamura, and T. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. **B489**, 184 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0005064.

[19] K. Hamaguchi, M. Kakizaki, and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 056007 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0212172.

[20] T. Watari and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B544**, 167 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0205090.

[21] M. Kakizaki and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. **B573**, 123 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0307362.

[22] T. Kobayashi, H. Shirano, and H. Terao, Prog. Theor. Phys. **113**, 1077 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0412299.

[23] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B598**, 237 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0406206.

[24] T. Kobayashi, Y. Omura, and H. Terao, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 053005 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0605121.

[25] Z.-z. Xing, D. Yang, and S. Zhou, Phys. Lett. **B690**, 304 (2010), arXiv:1004.4234.

[26] S. Zhou, Phys. Lett. **B704**, 291 (2011), arXiv:1106.4808.

[27] M. J. S. Yang, Phys. Lett. **B760**, 747 (2016), arXiv:1604.07896.

[28] M. Fukugita, M. Tanimoto, and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 113016 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9809554.

[29] M. Fukugita, M. Tanimoto, and T. Yanagida, (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9903484.

[30] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 275 (1974), [Erratum: Phys. Rev.D11,703(1975)].

[31] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B353**, 114 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9502297.

[32] H. Nishiura, K. Matsuda, and T. Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 013006 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9902385.

[33] K. Matsuda, T. Fukuyama, and H. Nishiura, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 053001 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9906433.

[34] Z.-z. Xing and H. Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B569**, 30 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0304234.

[35] Z.-z. Xing, J. Phys. **G23**, 1563 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9609204.

[36] K. Kang and S. K. Kang, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 1511 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9704253.

[37] A. Mondragon and E. Rodriguez-Jauregui, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 093009 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9807214.

[38] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977), T. Yanagida, KEK Report No. KEK-79-18, p. 95, M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979).

[39] N. Haba, R. Takahashi, M. Tanimoto, and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 113002 (2008), arXiv:0804.4055.

[40] A. Mondragon, M. Mondragon, and E. Peinado, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 076003 (2007), arXiv:0706.0354.

[41] J. Barranco, F. Gonzalez Canales, and A. Mondragon, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 073010 (2010), arXiv:1004.3781.

[42] F. González Canales, A. Mondragón, M. Mondragón, U. J. Saldaña Salazar, and L. Velasco-Sevilla, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 096004 (2013), arXiv:1304.6644.

[43] F. Gonzalez Canales, A. Mondragon, and M. Mondragon, Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 546 (2013), arXiv:1205.4755.

[44] U. J. Saldaña-Salazar, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 013002 (2016), arXiv:1509.08877.

[45] T. Blazek, S. F. King, and J. K. Parry, JHEP **05**, 016 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0303192.

[46] S. F. King, JHEP **08**, 130 (2014), arXiv:1406.7005.

[47] U. Aydemir, D. Minic, C. Sun, and T. Takeuchi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A31**, 1550223 (2016), arXiv:1509.01606.

[48] U. Aydemir, D. Minic, C. Sun, and T. Takeuchi, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A31**, 1650101 (2016), arXiv:1603.01756.

[49] K. S. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2845 (1993), arXiv:hep-ph/9209215.

[50] A. Masiero, S. K. Vempati, and O. Vives, Nucl. Phys. **B649**, 189 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0209303.

[51] S. Bertolini, T. Schwetz, and M. Malinsky, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 115012 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0605006.

[52] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. **B86**, 297 (1979).

[53] M. Bando, S. Kaneko, M. Obara, and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Lett. **B580**, 229 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0309310.

[54] M. Bando, S. Kaneko, M. Obara, and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **112**, 533 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0405071.

[55] G. Altarelli and D. Meloni, JHEP **08**, 021 (2013), arXiv:1305.1001.

[56] Z.-z. Xing, H. Zhang, and S. Zhou, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 113016 (2008), arXiv:0712.1419.

[57] S. Antusch, J. Kersten, M. Lindner, and M. Ratz, Nucl. Phys. **B674**, 401 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0305273.

[58] S. Antusch, J. Kersten, M. Lindner, M. Ratz, and M. A. Schmidt, JHEP **03**, 024 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0501272.

[59] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, and T. Schwetz, Nucl. Phys. **B908**, 199 (2016), arXiv:1512.06856.